

Appl. No. 09/975,353
Amdt. Dated March 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2005

Docket No. CM04824H
Customer No. 22917

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Virgile, et al. (USPN 5,898,686). Claims 3-5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Virgile in view of Samuel, et al. (USPN 6,018,766), hereinafter referred to as Samuel. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Virgile in view of Samuel and further in view of Yuan (US 2001/0041571).

The Examiner seems to be misinterpreting the primary reference used in the rejection, namely Virgile. Virgile does not teach the use of first and second multicast IP addresses as stated by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action. Instead, table 200 of Virgile shows that only a single multicast address is mapped to appropriate I/O ports of a bridge. As is known to one of ordinary skill in the art, such a mechanism is to control flooding out of all the I/O ports of a bridge.

In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention requires, among other limitations, "determining first and second multicast IP addresses to be used for [a] two-party call." Even though this limitation is not found in the cited art, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly delineate Applicants' invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly specify that the two multicast addresses are allocated for the two-party call between two devices in the communication system where the two multicast addresses are used for exchanging payload. As noted in the specification, such a communication is termed "full-duplex." Applicants' specification, page 9 line 3. Because such limitations are not found in the cited art, a rejection of Applicants' claims with the cited art is improper and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/975,353
Amdt. Dated March 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2005

Docket No. CM04624H
Customer No. 22917

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claims 7 and 8, but Applicants believe that Claims 1-10, as amended, are in allowable condition.

Applicants pray that an early notice of allowance will issue.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: Indira Saladi

Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,759

Telephone: 847-576-6735
Fax No.: 847-576-0721

Attachments